| 1 | | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 2 | EASTERN DIVISION | | |
| 3 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) Docket No. 15 CR 315 | |
| 4 | Plaintiff, |) Chicago, Illinois) March 22, 2016 | |
| 5 | v. |) 12:43 p.m. | |
| 6 | JOHN DENNIS HASTERT, |) | |
| 7 | Defendant. | Defendant.) | |
| 8 | TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Status BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS M. DURKIN | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | APPEARANCES: | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | ACHARY T. FARDON es Attorney by | |
| 13 | | A. BLOCK nited States Attorney | |
| 14 | 219 S. Dear Chicago, IL | born Street, 5th Floor 60604 | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | For the Defendant: SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP by MR. THOMAS C. GREEN (via telephone) | | |
| 17 | Washington, | et NW, Suite 600 D.C. 20005 | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | MR. JOHN N. | GALLO GALLO | |
| 20 | Chicago, IL | | |
| 21 | | AUVE CCD DDD CDD | |
| 22 | . Official Co | Official Court Reporter | |
| 23 | Chicago, IL | | |
| 24 | laura_renke | 3 @ilnd.uscourts.gov | |
| 25 | ? | | |

1 (In open court; defendant not present.) 2 (Clerk places telephone call.) 3 THE CLERK: Hi, Mr. Green. It's Sandy with Judge 4 Durkin. We just went ahead and called you because everybody 5 else is here in the courtroom. 6 MR. GREEN: Okay. I was just about to dial in. Okay. 15 CR 315, United States of THE CLERK: 7 America v. Hastert. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. BLOCK: Good morning -- afternoon, your Honor. 11 Steven Block on behalf of the United States. 12 MR. GREEN: Thomas Green by telephone, your Honor. 13 MR. GALLO: And John Gallo on behalf of Mr. Hastert. 14 THE COURT: All right. There was a request to have a 15 status in this case, and we're doing it now. So what is the 16 reason for the request? 17 MR. BLOCK: The reason for the request, Judge -- and 18 I've had some discussions with defense counsel about this, and 19 we called your clerk for a little guidance as to how we should 20 proceed. 21 As your Honor knows, we disclosed a couple weeks ago a 22 Individual D is how he's referred to in the witness. 23 supplemental government's version. That is a witness who the 24 government has learned about relatively recently as reflected 25 in that.

As you might imagine, without getting into a lot of details, his decision to talk to us has been quite a process and a difficult one at that.

He is deciding whether he would like to ask the Court to appear as a witness at the sentencing. He's not a hundred percent certain he wants to do that, but he has been moving in that direction, significantly enough that he was inquiring about the schedule and informed me that he is unable to be here on April 8th because he has a preexisting -- I understand it's a business trip out of town that, as I understand it, he's not able to move.

I don't know the details of that, but that's what was relayed to me.

So because of that, we recognize the interests of everybody, both parties and the Court, in getting the sentencing done. At the same time, we're trying to balance that with a -- I think a very unique witness, who we're trying to be sensitive to, that he's in a very difficult position.

And if he would like the ability to address the Court and if the Court's willing to listen to him, we would like as the government to facilitate that as best we can.

So that is why we have prepared a motion to continue the date. But before we filed it, we reached out to see if your Honor wanted to handle it a different way in terms of the extension as soon as practicable. We're not looking to extend

this either. It's simply that date does not work for this particular witness.

I know your Honor has asked if there are other witnesses in the past of both parties. I understand that there may be one other person who would like to speak as well. That person does not have a conflict, as far as I know. It's really this Individual D is the witness who has the conflict.

THE COURT: Is the other witness someone who has been identified by a letter in the indictment or in any of your submissions?

MR. BLOCK: The person has been identified to the Court and the parties in the submissions.

THE COURT: Which letter?

MR. BLOCK: It's not a letter.

THE COURT: Oh, there's a name?

MR. BLOCK: There's a name.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well --

MR. GREEN: May I be heard, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah. I just want to be -- because we don't even have a formal motion in front of us. But you anticipate one witness -- the witness who you've just referred to, not the letter -- by letter, but the other witness, that witness is definitely testifying?

MR. BLOCK: As I understand it, yes.

THE COURT: All right. And this other witness,

Individual D, is leaning toward testifying but has a conflict on the date we have set for sentencing.

MR. BLOCK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Green, go ahead.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, sir.

I have a couple of things that I would like to state here. First of all, this Witness D, as Mr. Block has indicated, has not apparently made a final decision whether he wishes to add something at sentencing or not. That's number one. And I think that the -- you know, the government should at least be obligated to drill down on that a little further here. That's I think important.

If we're going to continue the sentencing, we are not available in April, both because of Sidley's partners' meeting on one date, which is out of town and a very significant meeting, and then there's a religious holiday, Jewish religious holiday, Passover, on the last Friday.

And so that puts us -- I don't know where that puts us on your calendar.

But the other thing is that Mr. D -- Mr. D has been interviewed by the government, and the information which he imparted to the government is -- has been shared with the probation officer. It's shared with the Court and shared with us.

And neither Mr. D nor this other person, whom I'll

address in a moment, are classic victims under the Victim

Protection Act of -- I haven't got my manual in front of me.

But they're not classic victims, and so they have no statutory entitlement to appear.

And I think it's clear from the research I've seen that the Court has discretion to accept whatever remarks these individuals wish to make in writing. And I think there's a compelling reason for getting the sentencing concluded given my client's health and physical situation. You know, we feel very strongly that we would like to see this be completed as presently scheduled.

And, you know, I'm hopeful that the Court would consider receiving whatever information these individuals have in writing and then considering it on the papers, so to speak.

The other person is a woman who has been very public in her remarks. She's been on the networks. She's been interviewed in the newspapers. And my understanding of her information is that her brother, who is now deceased, told her some number of years ago that he had had a sexual experience or experiences with my client.

And in all of the accounts that this woman has given in the press, at least the ones I've seen, she was -- she did not come forth with any details of what -- or any, you know, specific allegations of conduct on the part of my client. And it appears that she may well not be in possession of any

details, even if, indeed, there are details. And her observations would certainly be hearsay in substantial respect.

So I don't know exactly what -- what she would offer or what benefit the Court would receive from her hearsay statements which have been, as I say, publicized widely up to this point in time.

So that's -- you know, that's -- that's kind of my thinking on this at this point.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Gallo, since you can't consult with Mr. Green face to face, is there anything you want to add on behalf of the defense?

MR. GALLO: Judge, only that we are prepared with respect to Individual C -- or D, rather. It is not our present intention to contest the allegations made by Individual D. So we're -- what's in the supplement to the government's version of the offense, at the present time we have no intention of objecting to it. So that's a data point for the Court.

The other thing is I have cases, Judge, which talk about the issue, in particular about in circumstances where there's no dispute about non-victim statements that the Court should limit those statements to written submissions. I have a couple cites here, but -- which I can give the Court. So --

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Block?

MR. BLOCK: Couple points, Judge.

First, as to the issue of whether these individuals

are considered victims under the Victim Protection Act, it's not our contention that they are. There's not a statutory right for them to speak, and they would be subject to cross-examination in a way they would not be if they were under the act.

However, that doesn't end the inquiry. The Court oftentimes hears testimony from witnesses or statements at sentencing to help the Court make decisions, both from the defendant and from the government. There's nothing unusual about that.

To Mr. Green's point, he appears to be collapsing a couple things together: One is the schedule, and two is whether the Court should let these witnesses speak at all. Those seem to be separate issues.

But as to whether the Court should let them speak, government's view that absolutely the Court should let them speak. It's relevant information as to the defendant's history and characteristics. The fact that the defense may not challenge the specifics of what the defendant did to Mr. D does not mean the Court shouldn't consider the effects on Individual D. And I fully expect that is what he is going to testify or give a statement about is how this has affected his life.

Similarly, the other witness we've been talking about, whether it's hearsay or not, she certainly can provide useful

information to the Court as to what the defendant's conduct did to her, to her family. And I would expect the Court would want to factor that information in whatever way it thought relevant at a sentencing.

So we do think they should be allowed to speak if that's the issue. And, unfortunately, because of the process that Individual D is going through, which I don't think we should make light of, we're asking for more time.

And that's -- I'm not here lightly either. Obviously, we want to get this done with. But we thought it was important enough that we had to come and ask your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GREEN: May I add something, sir?

THE COURT: Last words. Then I'm going to have my own comments. But go ahead, Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: Your Honor, if I heard Mr. Block correctly that D wishes to come and testify, you know, about the impact it's had, I do note from reading D's 302, et cetera, that it appears that he's consulted, you know, medical help and maybe even psychological help or whatever.

And, you know, I look upon D as I would any other witness, that if he's going to come and put his emotional well-being or physical well-being into issue, then I think there's an implicit waiver of his privilege with any physician or mental health specialist.

And I would seek, you know, discovery by way of subpoena or whatever so that I have -- I mean, if he's going to come, I need to be prepared to cross-examine. I don't know whether I would or wouldn't, but I need to be prepared. I owe that obligation to my client. And so I just want to note that as well.

THE COURT: All right. Well, under 3553(a), I am required to consider the history and characteristics of the defendant. If victims of -- and let's not beat around the bush. If Individual D wants to come in and talk about being a victim of sexual abuse, he's entitled to do so because that informs my decision about the history and characteristics of the defendant. It's that simple.

If the sister of a victim of sexual abuse wants to come in and talk about her interactions with her brother and talk about that, that is something that would inform my decisions about the history and characteristics of the defendant.

If the government chooses to bring them in as live witnesses, they're entitled to do so. Hearsay is admissible in a sentencing hearing, so I'm not concerned about hearsay regarding the sister.

But if they want to come in and they're willing to testify as live witnesses, they're absolutely entitled to do so, and the government's entitled to call them as live

witnesses.

If the government wants to present that evidence through documents, they can. And I'm leaving that up to the government because they're the ones that are presenting this in aggravation.

So that's my ruling.

Now, Mr. Green, if you want to cross-examine

Individual D about aspects of that, it really depends on what
your cross is. There's limits to the kinds of cross -- legally
there's limits, and, frankly, as a practical matter, I'd be -there are practical limits to what I would allow on crossexamination of this.

If you think there is something factually incorrect with what the witness is saying, in spite of Mr. Gallo just saying that you're prepared to admit to what Individual D says, but if you think there's something that Individual D says in court that's factually inaccurate or in any way subject to cross, you'll get to cross-examine him.

But I'm not going to delay this for any lengthy period to allow a -- you know, multiple subpoenas to go out.

Mr. Block, if Individual D is coming -- going to testify, I'd ask you to speak to Mr. Green and Mr. Gallo. Give them a preview of what he intends to say. Then, Mr. Green, you decide when you know what he's going to say whether you feel it necessary to issue subpoenas to get records that would possibly

impeach anything he may say.

But I'm not going to prejudge that until we actually have a representation from the government about what he's going to say.

MR. GREEN: Yes, sir. I understand.

THE COURT: Okay. I have appointed a medical expert. I'm not going to identify him at this time. I will shortly by way of a court order. But I have identified a medical expert that the parties are aware of. He is fast at work reviewing medical records so that I can get, to my satisfaction, an independent medical opinion as to the health of the defendant. And he is fast at work on that.

At some point he will let me know whether he feels it necessary to either interview the defendant or possibly even examine him, but I'm leaving that up to his expert -- his own expertise because he has extensive medical records he is reviewing. And whether he needs to do more beyond review the records to render an opinion to me is something I'm going to leave up to him. It's not my expertise, and that's why I have him employed to do this.

As to the date itself, Mr. Block, the Individual D is aware of the seriousness of trying to move this ahead and why moving this date is going to impact a number of things?

MR. BLOCK: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. And is his trip immovable?

MR. BLOCK: It is. And, Judge, we did reach out to him again right before coming to court to try and have the latest update. And the information I've received, once again, is that, without putting too many details on the record, it's a business trip involving several other people and, for professional reasons, he can't move it and also that he is currently -- as I expected, he is inclined to appear in person to seek the Court's permission to make a statement or provide testimony.

THE COURT: No, and I'll let him. I will certainly let him.

All right. Well, the problem is if we don't do it on April 8th, Mr. Green, you and Mr. Gallo are unavailable the rest of April?

MR. GALLO: Well, Judge, the two dates you gave us were the 15th and the 22nd.

THE COURT: I could work on other dates. My problem is if we get into May, I can't do it until the week of the 23rd of May.

MR. GALLO: Okay. Well, the dates that we had heard -- so if there are other dates in April, Judge, that's a different story.

THE COURT: I could possibly give you some dates the week of the 25th. I have a trial scheduled, but I may reschedule that trial in order to allow for this sentencing to

occur.

MR. GALLO: Okay.

THE COURT: And if there's another date that will work, rather than put this all on the record, we'll go off the record. I'll allow you all to speak to Ms. Newland and discuss a date.

And there's another matter I want to put on the record -- but I want to seal it -- that deals with the identity of Individual D. And so we are now going to remain on the record, but this part of the transcript is going to be sealed.

(Proceedings had under seal not herein transcribed.)

THE COURT: Now we're back on the record in unsealed portion.

And I'd ask the parties to speak to my courtroom deputy about an acceptable date in April, possibly the week of the 25th. I'm willing to defer or move a trial I have that week in order to accommodate the parties' schedules and the witness's schedules.

Is it still the anticipation of the parties that this entire sentencing will last no more than a day?

MR. BLOCK: Certainly for the government, yes.

MR. GALLO: Unquestionably.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we will give you a day. I won't limit it to a morning or an afternoon. We'll start in the morning. I'll keep the day clear in the event things spill

over. But I'll keep the day clear. But I'd ask you offline with my courtroom deputy to work together on an acceptable date that works for the government's witnesses, works for the defendant and defense counsel.

And, as I said earlier, hopefully I'll have some more clarity from the court-appointed expert about the defendant's health also.

All right. Anything else we need to discuss -Mr. Block, are you going to make a formal motion to continue
the sentencing date?

MR. BLOCK: If your Honor would like me to file it, I will. If I don't need to, I certainly don't need to.

THE COURT: No, you've made an oral motion to continue it today, and that's sufficient. We don't need a written motion. And this will be part of the public record, so if anyone wants to see it, they're free to see the reasons why you're seeking an extension of the sentencing date.

So work with my courtroom deputy on a date. If we can't arrive at a date, I'm going to ask you to come back for another status, a brief status, and we'll come up with another date that may be extended. And I don't want to do that if at all possible.

MR. GALLO: Thank you.

MR. BLOCK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Green, at your end?

MR. GREEN: No, sir. Thank you. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Anything else from the attorneys in court? 3 4 MR. BLOCK: No, your Honor. MR. GALLO: No, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 6 (Concluded at 1:07 p.m.) 7 8 CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the 9 record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 10 11 12 /s/ LAURA R. RENKE March 23, 2016 LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR 13 Official Court Reporter 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25